

Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114
Application No. 10/800,630
Attorney Docket No. 042236

REMARKS

Allowable Claims

Applicants gratefully acknowledges that claim 23 was merely objected to as depending from a rejected base claim, but are otherwise allowable.

Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 5, 9, 12-19, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publication No. 2001-015237 (JP 2001-015237).

Responding to Applicants' previous response, the Examiner alleged as follows:

In response to applicant's argument that reference numeral 2A is a housing of the socket but not the substrate of the semiconductor device. The term substrate of the semiconductor device is used to indicate the body of the semiconductor device 11 or interposer 13 in the specification and drawings, but the term is never used meaning a portion of a socket or anything else outside the semiconductor device. The examiner respectfully disagrees. **The "a substrate of the semiconductor device" is a general or broad term it may be interpreted as a base of the semiconductor device, a printed circuit board of the semiconductor device, a wiring substrate of the semiconductor device, a mounting board of the semiconductor device, or a housing of a socket of the semiconductor device etc.** For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

(Office Action, page 2, emphasis added).

Claim 5 has been amended to recite "a second surface having a projecting portion to be brought into contact with a substrate of the semiconductor device and a depressed portion not to be brought into contact with parts mounted in the semiconductor device, wherein the substrate

has a semiconductor chip mounted thereon,” and “an engaging portion to engage the semiconductor device protection cover with the substrate of the semiconductor device, so as to detachably attach the semiconductor device protection cover to the semiconductor device.”

Thus, claim 5 clearly recites that substrate has a semiconductor chip mounted on it.

JP 2001-015237 discloses a semiconductor socket which has a housing 2A for housing an integrated circuit 1 and a cover 2B for fixing the integrated circuit 1. The cover 2B is fixed onto the housing 2A.

Even assuming that the cover 2B corresponds to the semiconductor device protection cover of the present invention, the projecting portion of the second surface is brought into contact with the housing 2A of the socket but NOT with a **substrate of the semiconductor device on which a semiconductor chip is mounted**.

Moreover, the engaging portion of the cover 2B engages the cover with the housing 2A of the socket but NOT with the substrate of the semiconductor device.

Thus, JP 2001-015237 does not teach or suggest “a second surface having a projecting portion to be brought into contact with a substrate of the semiconductor device and a depressed portion not to be brought into contact with parts mounted in the semiconductor device, wherein the substrate has a semiconductor chip mounted thereon; and “an engaging portion to engage the semiconductor device protection cover with the substrate of the semiconductor device, so as to detachably attach the semiconductor device protection cover to the semiconductor device,” as recited in claim 5.

Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114
Application No. 10/800,630
Attorney Docket No. 042236

Claim 13 similarly recites “a second surface to be brought into contact with a substrate of the semiconductor device and with parts mounted in the semiconductor device, said second surface being formed from an elastic material, wherein the substrate has a semiconductor chip mounted thereon.”

Claim 14 similarly recites “a second surface having a projecting portion to be brought into contact with a substrate of the semiconductor device and a depressed portion not to be brought into contact with parts mounted in the semiconductor device, wherein the substrate has a semiconductor chip mounted thereon.”

For at least these reasons, claims 5, 13 and 14 patentably distinguish over JP 2001-015237. Claims 9 and 12 depending from claim 5, and claims 15-19, 24 and 25 depending from claim 14 also patentably distinguish over JP 2001-015237 for at least the same reasons.

Thus, the 35 USC §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 7, 8 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over JP 2001-015237.

Claims 7, 8 and 10 depend from claim 5, and claim 20 indirectly depending from 14. As discussed above, claims 5 and claim 14 patentably distinguish over JP 2001-015237. Because the independent claims patentably distinguish over the prior art, dependent claims also patentably distinguish over JP 2001-015237 for at least the same reasons.

Submission under 37 C.F.R. §1.114
Application No. 10/800,630
Attorney Docket No. 042236

The disclosures of JP 2001-015237 further referred to in this rejection do not remedy the deficiencies of the disclosure of JP 2001-015237 discussed above.

For at least these reasons, claims 7, 8 and 10 depending from claim 5 and claim 20 indirectly depending from 14, also patentably distinguish over JP 2001-015237.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection should be withdrawn.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Sadao Kinashi

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,075
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/ar